1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	JERRYALL JEROME CULLER, No. C 17-6265 WHA (PR)
10	Petitioner, ORDER OF DISMISSAL
11	V. (D. 1.4.) (2)
12	RON DAVIS, Warden, (Docket No. 2)
13	Respondent.
14	
15	INTRODUCTION
16	Petitioner, a California prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a petition for a writ of habeas
17	corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2254. The petition challenges the denial of parole by the
18	California Board of Parole Hearings ("Board"). The application to proceed in forma pauperis is
19	GRANTED.
20	ANALYSIS
21	A. STANDARD OF REVIEW
22	This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in
23	custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in
24	violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. 2254(a); Rose
25	v. Hodges, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). Habeas corpus petitions must meet heightened pleading
26	requirements. McFarland v. Scott, 512 U.S. 849, 856 (1994). An application for a federal writ
27	of habeas corpus filed by a prisoner who is in state custody pursuant to a judgment of a state
28	court must "specify all the grounds for relief which are available to the petitioner and shall set

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

forth in summary form the facts supporting each of the grounds thus specified." Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, 28 U.S.C. foll. 2254. "[N]otice' pleading is not sufficient, for the petition is expected to state facts that point to a 'real possibility of constitutional error." Rule 4 Advisory Committee Notes (quoting *Aubut v. Maine*, 431 F.2d 688, 689 (1st Cir. 1970)).

B. LEGAL CLAIMS

Petitioner claims that the denial of parole amounts to re-sentencing him to a new term, He contends that the Board violated his right to due process by relying on false conclusions about his mental state, a preponderance of the evidence standard, its own self-interests, insufficient evidence of his being a threat to society, and a no-parole policy. For purposes of federal habeas review, a California prisoner is entitled to only "minimal" procedural protections in connection with a parole suitability determination. Swarthout v Cooke, 131 S.Ct. 859, 863 (2011). The procedural protections to which the prisoner is entitled under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution are limited to an opportunity to be heard and a statement of the reasons why parole was denied. *Id.* at 862. The constitution does not require more. Ibid. The court in Swarthout explained that no Supreme Court case "supports converting California's 'some evidence' rule into a substantive federal requirement." *Ibid.* It is simply irrelevant in federal habeas review "whether California's 'some evidence' rule of judicial review (a procedure beyond what the Constitution demands) was correctly applied." *Id.* at 863. As the Supreme Court has determined that the federal guarantee of due process does not require any amount of evidence to support the parole denial, and petitioner received the procedural guarantees of a hearing and statement of reasons for the denial, his claims fail to establish grounds for habeas relief.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED**.

Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases now requires a district court to rule on whether a petitioner is entitled to a certificate of appealability in the same order in which the petition is dismissed. Petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing that a reasonable

jurist would find this court's denial of his claim debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Consequently, no certificate of appealability is warranted in this case. The clerk shall enter judgment and close the file. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: December _______, 2017. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE